



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,125	02/20/2004	Douglas J. Koslow	CA7037682001	5265

55497 7590 04/06/2009  
VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP  
1885 Lundy Avenue  
Suite 108  
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
----------

JACOB, MARY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/06/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,125	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOSLOW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MARY C. JACOB	<b>Art Unit</b> 2123	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARY C. JACOB. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Erich C. Tzou, Reg. No. 56,927. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hollander (US Patent 6,182,258).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Tzou and the Examiner discussed their interpretations of the Hollander reference in view of the rejection of claim 1, specifically in regards to "an electronic design comprising both an HDL portion and a general programming language portion".

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mary C Jacob/ Examiner, Art Unit 2123	
---	--